UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,722	08/08/2006	Naohiro Yoshida	129018	1980
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 06/04/201 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	SCULLY, STEVEN M		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/04/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/588,722	YOSHIDA, NAOHIRO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Steven Scully	1795		

	Steven Scully	1795					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (f).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO				
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee had a straight of the straight of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as a set for the final cycle of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final office action; or (2) as a straight of the shortened patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter							
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w  AMENDMENTS			, арреат. Отнес а				
	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co							
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		II. ( A )   ( //	TOL 004				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		:					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable ii submilled in a separate, t	imely filed amendmen	it canceling the				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 7-13.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea , and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a ).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795							
·							

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendment to claims 9 and 12 is entered. Arguments with respect to rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are not found persuasive. Particularly, applicant argues that the ejector pump (4) of Kazuo does not cause a pressure fluctuation problem on its outlet side, thus the ejector pump (4) of Kazuo does not correspond to the claimed fuel gas pump. These arguments are not found to be commensurate with the scope of the claimed invention which requires "a fuel gas pump for circulating the fuel gas in the circulation route", which the Examiner believes to be met by the ejector pump (4) of Kazuo. Further, it remains the position of the Examiner that the valve (31) is a pressure-regulating means which is on the ufel gas supply line and regulates a pressure of the fuel gas supplied from the fuel gas supply source, thus it is proper to be interpreted as the claimed pressure-regulating means. The presence of a separate valve (1) also on the fuel gas supply line is not found to be a persuasive argument for at least the reason of the claim having "comprising" language, and because the limitation is believed to be properly rejected by valve (31).